

REMARKSClaim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1 through 15 are pending in the current application. Claims 1 through 4 and 6 through 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Birdwell et al. (US 6,032,197), hereinafter referred to as Birdwell. Claims 1, 2, 4 through 8, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bormann, "Robust Header Compression (ROHC): Framework and four profiles: RTP, UDP, ESP, and uncompressed," Internet Engineering Task Force IETF Draft. Applicant presents amendments and traversals after giving due consideration to the arguments for rejection presented in the office action.

Applicant's invention as claimed is including header compression information in a transmission, and updating this information periodically or when necessary. This header compression information is sent in a decompression information segment that is separate from a payload frame. Please see the paragraph [1051] and Figure 8 in the specification as originally filed. Birdwell does not teach a separate decompression information segment. In contrast, Birdwell column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 1 teaches: "The packet encoder appends a compression key to each packet, regardless of whether the packet is full-length or reduced length." Furthermore, Birdwell recites in column 4, lines 29-33: "The client then rebuilds compressed headers from the uncompressed headers in the table to decompress the reduced-length packets." Therefore, Birdwell does not teach sending the header compression information in a segment separate from the payload data packets. Applicant amends independent claims 1, 6, 10, 11, and 12 to highlight this difference.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 does not read on Birdwell because the "header protocol information portion" is separate from the broadcast content portion containing the "broadcast content portion comprising a plurality of transmission frames." As discussed above, Birdwell neither teaches nor recites the separate transmission of header compression information. Therefore, claim 13 is allowable as it stands.

The Examiner cites Bormann against claims 1, 2, 4 through 8, 10, 11, and 13. Bormann clearly states in Section 4.2. Dynamicity that "ROHC does not assume that this state can change dynamically during the channel lifetime (and does not explicitly support such changes, although

some changes may be innocuous from a protocol point of view). Therefore, Bormann does not teach a decompression information segment that can update the compression parameters. In contrast, Applicant's claims explicitly support such changes with the transmission of the decompression information segment. Hence, none of Applicant's claims read on Bormann.

From the discussion above all independent claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are allowable. Furthermore, all of their dependent claims are allowable because they include all elements and limitations of the independent claims.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 01/26/2004

By: *Krupit Patel 38,812 for*

Rupit Patel, Reg. No. 53,441
(858) 651-7435

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502